



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,452	04/22/2004	Jean-Marc Ghigo	251030US0	7747

22850 7590 10/06/2006

C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

VOGEL, NANCY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1636

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/829,452

Applicant(s)

GHIGO ET AL.

Examiner

Nancy T. Vogel

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner:
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-25, drawn to a method of identifying a substance which inhibits the formation of a bacterial biofilm comprising providing a host cell expressing at least one protein selected from the group set forth in claim 1, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- II. Claim 26, drawn to a substance produced by the method of claim 1, classified in class and subclass unknown.
- III. Claim 27, drawn to a substance produced by the method of claim 2, classified in class and subclass unknown.
- IV. Claim 28, drawn to a substance produced by the method of claim 3, classified in class and subclass unknown.
- V. Claim 29, drawn to a substance produced by the method of claim 4, classified in class and subclass unknown.
- VI. Claim 30, drawn to a substance produced by the method of claim 5, classified in class and subclass unknown.
- VII. Claim 31, drawn to a substance produced by the method of claim 6, classified in class and subclass unknown.
- VIII. Claims 32-35, drawn to a method of inhibiting the formation of a bacterial biofilm, or treating at least one substrate on which a biofilm has

developed, or inhibiting the formation of a biofilm on at least one substrate, comprising contacting with at least one substance identified according to claim 1, classified in class 435 subclass 243.

- IX. Claims 36-44, drawn to a method of detecting differentially expressed polynucleotide sequences which are specifically correlated with a mature bacterial biofilm comprising labeling a polynucleotide sample by reacting with a labeled probe immobilized on a solid support wherein said probe comprises at least one polynucleotide sequence selected from the group consisting of those listed in claim 36, classified in class 435 subclass 6.
- X. Claims 45-50, drawn to a method of detecting significantly overexpressed genes correlated with a mature bacterial biofilm comprising detecting a polynucleotide sequence or subsequence of a polynucleotide selected from one of the group set forth in claim 45, classified in class 435 subclass 6.
- XI. Claims 51-58, drawn to a polynucleotide library useful in the molecular characterization of a mature bacterial biofilm comprising one or more of the polynucleotide sequences listed in the claims listed in claim 51-54, class 536 subclass 23.1.

In regard to Groups I and VIII-XI, applicant is required to select one combination of genes, or one method utilizing one combination of genes, for examination. If the selected combination contains ten or fewer

Art Unit: 1636

sequences, all of the sequences of the combination will be searched. If the selected combination contains more than ten sequences, the combination will be examined following the procedures set forth in example (B). More specifically, the combination will be searched until one nucleotide sequence is found to be allowable with the examiner choosing the order of search to maximize the identification of an allowable sequence.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Group II-VII and VIII are related as product and process of use.

The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the process as claimed can be practiced with any of the patentably distinct products of claims II-VII.

Inventions of Groups I and II-VII are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by chemical synthesis.

Inventions of Groups I and VIII-X are biologically and functionally different and distinct from each other and thus one does not render the other obvious. The methods of Groups I and VIII-XI comprise steps which are not required for or present in the methods of the other groups: measuring the level of at least one protein or RNA transcript of at least one gene and comparing the level of said protein or RNA transcript with that of a cell not contacted with a substance (I); contacting cells with a substance (VIII); labeling a polynucleotide sample with a labeled probe immobilized on a solid support (IX); detecting at least one polynucleotide sequence (X). The end result of the methods are different: identification of a substance (I); a bacterial composition free of biofilm (VIII); isolation of differentially expressed polynucleotide sequence (IX); isolation of significantly overexpressed genes (X). Thus, the operation, function and effects of these different methods are different and distinct from each other. Therefore, the inventions of these different, distinct groups are capable of supporting separate patents.

The products of Group II-VII and XI, are chemically, biologically, and functionally distinct from each other and thus one does not render the other obvious. The product of each group is not needed to produce the products of the other groups (each of which can be isolated from cells or organisms, made synthetically, and/or are self-replicating without the need for the isolated products of the other groups). Therefore, the inventions of the groups are capable of supporting separate patents.

Except for the specific relationships described above, the invention of Groups I-XI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed

as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP 806.04, MPEP 808.01). In the instant case the different products of Groups II-VII are not used in or made by the methods of Groups I and VIII-XI.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Further more, especially in instances where the classifications are the same, the non-patent literature searches required for each of these inventions are not co-extensive, hence said searches would be burdensome. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

Art Unit: 1636

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Art Unit: 1636

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nancy T. Vogel whose telephone number is (571) 272-0780. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 - 3:00, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Irem Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

10/2/06


NANCY VOGEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER